

AGC/WSDOT Structures Team Meeting
September 14, 2001
9:00 – Noon WSDOT Corson Avenue Facility

Attendees:

| Member | Company/Agency | Telephone | Fax No. |
|---------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Charlie McCoy | Atkinson Construction | (425) 255-7551 | (425) 255-7335 |
| Forrest Dill | RCI | (253) 863-5200 | (206) 859-5702 |
| Kevin Parish | Mowat Construction Co. | (425) 398-0205 | (425) 398-0226 |
| Dan Leachman | Kiewit Construction Co | (425) 255-8333 | (425) 255-9755 |
| Ron Lewis | WSDOT | (360) 705-7827 | (360) 705-6809 |
| John VanLund | WSDOT | (360) 705-7217 | (360) 705-6814 |
| Dave Golden | WSDOT (Bridge office) | (360) 705-7226 | (360) 705-6914 |
| Tom Madden | WSDOT | (206) 768-5861 | (206) 768-5786 |

Ron Lewis called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

1) PDA/CAPWAP – Pile Driving and wall thickness

The first issue discussed concerned section 6.05.3 of the standard specifications concerning pile driving. Ron revisited the issue of limiting the allowable stress to 50 ksi maximum and limiting the driving resistance to 70 blows or less when the driving resistance specified in the Contract is reached. There was some discussion as to whether WSDOT would allow the use of PDAs and CAPWAP information for driving criteria. Ron said that he would have to discuss this with Tony Allen in the Geotechnical Section.

2) Stay in Place Forms

Ron said the State still has concerns about stay in place (SIP) forms made from steel (steel pan forms similar to those commonly used in building construction) but that we will consider using SIP concrete forms that are in essence part of the structural concrete deck. There was some discussion about the various applications on steel girders with concrete decks, box girders, and prestressed concrete girder decks. The Contractors felt that consideration should be given in any case where an advantage in safety from objects falling on traffic, or where fall protection would be realized. Ron said he would carry this subject on and maybe continue try it on selected projects. He would like to get results from the pilot projects being constructed at this time. Dan Leachman ask whether we might consider SIP forms for Sunset I/C. Ron said it would depend on the application, but we would consider a proposal. Charlie McCoy suggested a workshop with designers to discuss the issues.

3) Approach Slab Discussion – Skewed and Square

David Golden from the Bridge and Structures office handed out some details of bridge approach slabs that showed proposed revisions to the Standard Plans. These details would be in each contract, but would not detail out each bar in the slabs. The Contractor would need to do their own takeoff, and the quantities would be based on area. Some highlights of the discussion included the obtuse corner cracking issue and rebar detail, and the square vs. skewed slabs. Dave will make some revisions to the plans and send an updated copy to the group at a future meeting.

4) Cold Weather Concreting

Ron passed out a draft specification for cold weather concreting, explaining that the specification had been written many years ago, and was probably out of date, and not being followed consistently. The revisions included keeping the concrete above 50 degrees Fahrenheit throughout the cure period, and the use of recording thermometers to assure curing conditions. There was discussion about having the cure period adjusted if the temperatures fall below the minimums. Ron said he would like the group to look at the draft, and that he would like to finalize the verbiage at the next meeting.

5) Roughened Surface – Better Definition

Ron discussed the issue of a better definition of “roughened surface”. He said the requirements are often different for new vs. old (widening) construction, and that the Contractors are alleging the State offices are enforcing the spec in an inconsistent manner. There was discussion of the 1/4” RMS surface roughness and what it meant, as opposed to hydroblasting or bush hammering. He would like a way to specify what we want that is understood by the workers in the field, and can be readily understood by both the State and the Contractor’s people. Ron will bring a draft of a new specification to a future meeting.

6) Bolted Construction, calibrated (“LeJeune”) bolts

Kevin Parish continued the discussion of LeJeune bolts. The Contractors would like to have the option available for a future steel construction project, even if it is on a “pilot” or limited project. Kevin suggested that there might be up to a 30% savings. John Van Lund pointed out that we do allow this type of bolts on our cantilevered monotube sign bridges. Ron said he would talk to an erector and discuss some of the issues that WSDOT has with this type of bolts.

Next meeting:

9:00 to Noon, October 26th, 2001 at the Corson Avenue facility

Subjects carried forward:

- Precast Approach Slabs
- LeJeune Bolts
- Cold Weather Concreting
- Roughened surface